REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-8, 11-14, 16-18 and 20-22 remain pending in this application. Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 15 and 19 have been canceled, and their recitations incorporated into their respective base claims (similar changes have been made to the other independent claims); this action is taken without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. In all, Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 11-14, 16-18, 20 and 22 have been amended, the changes other than those already mentioned being purely formal ones.

Claims 1, 6, 11, 14, 18 and 22 are independent.

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,434,265 (Xiong et al.).

Independent Claim 1 recites, among other important features, that the mapping mode is changed, and that when an image formed by changing the mapping mode in the changing step does not comply with a predetermined condition set in accordance with the mapping mode, a warning is issued, and a synthesized image is generated in accordance with a predetermined condition.

Xiong has been discussed adequately in the previous prosecution, and it is not deemed necessary to repeat that discussion in full. Applicants note that that patent deals with a plurality of "typical geometries". However, Applicants strongly assert that nowhere is anything found in *Xiong*, that identifies those typical geometries. Much less has anything been found in that patent that would teach or suggest giving a warning in accordance with a change of the typical geometries.

In the official Action, the Examiner states that a poor selection of the viewing lane gives a shadow or ghost effect. However, Applicants submit that *Xiong* does

not disclose the selection of a viewing plane. Further, *Xiong* describes that a shadow or ghost occurs when two images are not perfectly blended. On the contrary, in *Xiong*, even if a viewing plane is changed for a blended image which had no shadow or ghost, shadow or ghost does not occur.

That is, as far as Applicants can see, *Xiong* does *not* suggest that a warning is given in accordance with a change of mapping mode, as in Claim 1. For at least that reason, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is clearly allowable over *Xiong*.

Independent Claim 14 is directed to an image synthesis method conforming to a plurality of mapping transformation modes. The method recited in Claim 14 comprises setting one mapping mode out of a plurality of mapping modes each corresponding to a different mapping surface, and generating, prior to synthesizing a plurality of input images, coordinate-space transformation parameters for transforming a coordinate space of one image among the images into a coordinate space of another image. The images are combined, based on a given mapping mode and the coordinate-space transformation parameters, and there is issued a mapping mode changing instruction. According to Claim 14, in the image synthesis step, coordinate information parameters set for each of the mapping modes are changed and the input images are again combined in accordance with the changing instruction issued in the changing instruction step.

Applicants strongly assert that nothing has been found in *Xiong* that would teach or suggest holding a parameter indicating the relation between the images to be synthesized and a parameter determined in accordance with a mapping mode separately.

Further, *Xiong* does not suggest that when a mapping mode is changed, the above parameter indicating the relation between the images is used without being changed,

and the parameter determined in accordance with the mapping mode is changed to perform a synthesizing process, as recited in Claim 14. For these reasons, Claim 14 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Xiong*.

The other independent claims are each respectively either an apparatus or a computer memory medium claim corresponding to one or the other of method Claims 1 and 14, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with the latter claims.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. At the very least, cancellation of Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 15 and 19 eliminates all issues relating to those claims. In any event, however, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, the

Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' attorney of record may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 29,286

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 359171 v1